

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, Claims 1, 9-13, and 19-21 have been amended and new claims 22-26 have been added. Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

1. Claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chapman, Jr. et al. (US006704567B1). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chapman does not disclose “entering a personal identification number (PIN) as requested in response to the request to make a secure call; and receiving at least one message authorizing a secure call request if a valid PIN is entered,” as claimed now in claims 9, 10, 19, and 20.

Therefore, since Chapman does not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

2. Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Salihi (U.S. Patent No. 6,077,791). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Salihi does not disclose “confirming transition to the clear mode as received in response to the message,” as now claimed in claims 11 and 21.

Therefore, since Salihi does not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

1. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A). in view of Mannisto (US005805084A). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses “entering a secure mode if the key is held for a time period greater than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode; and staying in a clear

mode if the key is held for a time period less than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode,” as claimed now in independent claims 1, 12 and 13.

Therefore, since Walter and Mannisto, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

2. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A). in view of Mannisto (US005805084A)as applied to claim 1 above , and further in view of Alanara et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,205). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

As stated above, neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses “entering a secure mode if the key is held for a time period greater than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode; and staying in a clear mode if the key is held for a time period less than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode,” as claimed now in independent claims 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Alanara et al do not disclose this limitation either.

Therefore, since the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

3. Claims 6, 7, 8, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter et al. (US006151677A). in view of Mannisto (US005805084A) as applied to claim 2 above , and further in view of Harris et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,406 B1). Applicants respectfully respond to the rejection.

As stated above, neither Walter nor Mannisto discloses “entering a secure mode if the key is held for a time period greater than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode; and staying in a clear mode if the key is held for a time period less than the predetermined amount of time unless the handset is currently in either secure-only or auto secure mode,” as claimed now in independent claims 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Harris et al do not disclose this limitation either.

Therefore, since the cited references, singly or in combination, do not disclose at least the above limitations, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

**Specification**

Applicant provides herewith amendments to the abstract. The amendments to the abstract are made by presenting marked up replacement paragraphs which identify changes made relative to the immediate prior version.

The changes made are primarily typographical or grammatical in nature, or involve minor clarifications of awkward wordings.

Applicant believes these changes add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

**Drawings**

Applicant submits that the above amendment to the drawings do not make any substantive changes or introduce any new material but are simply the correction of typographical errors, which are consistent with the specification as originally submitted. Therefore, approval and entry of the above amendments are respectfully requested.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2004

By: Abdullah Katbab  
Abdullah Katbab, Reg. No. 45,325  
(858) 651-4132

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 3. This sheet, which includes FIG. 3, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 3. “Yes” and “No” have been reversed at block 304.